

REMARKS

Applicants wish to thank Examiner Lau for the courtesy of the telephone interview with applicants' undersigned attorney on Friday, April 8, 2005. In that interview, the present amendment was discussed and it was indicated that this amendment would overcome the rejection of the claims on the basis of the Rochelle and Hendrix references. However, the examiner indicated that the amendment would likely necessitate further search. Accordingly, there is submitted herewith a Request for Continued Examination.

Claims 1-28 are rejected under either 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Rochelle of record, or under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Rochelle in view of Hendrix, of record.

The independent claims have all been amended to positively recite all of the features heretofore set forth in the preambles of the claims. Thus, as amended, the claims now are directed to an apparatus and method for measuring the relative locations of points on a vehicle, utilizing plural electromagnetic sources and receivers, and including a unique display technique which indicates, for each source and each receiver, whether or not the source is in the field of view of the receiver. Thus, for example, each of claims 1 and 16 recites a display device coupled to a processor having a program routine "for monitoring each receiver and generating on the display device a graphical display indicating for each source and each receiver whether or not the source is in the field of view of the receiver." Similarly, claim 24 recites a method including "providing an indication as to whether or not any source is outside the field of view of any receiver and, if so, identifying which source or sources and which receiver or receivers." The type of display generated by the claimed invention is set forth in applicants' figs. 9A-9C. No such arrangement is disclosed or suggested by either cited reference.

The claimed system also includes an electromagnetic radiation source disposed on a hand-held probe having an indicator which indicates whether the source is in the field of view of all of the receivers or all but one of the receivers. Thus, for example, claim 8 recites a radiation source on a hand-held probe and “an indicator on the hand-held probe” and a processor program routine for “causing the indicator to operate in a first mode if the source is in the field of view of all of the receivers and in a second mode if the source is in the field of view of all but one of the receivers.” Similarly, claim 16 recites a system including first sources adapted to be fixed relative to the vehicle and a second source on the hand-held probe, the processor program including a routine “causing the indicator to operate in the first mode if the at least one second source is in the field of view of all of the receivers and in a second mode if the at least one second source is in the field of view of all but one of the receivers.” No such arrangement is disclosed or suggested by the cited references.

In support of the rejection, the examiner refers only to page 1, section 0006 of Rochelle. That section, which discusses prior art to the Rochelle application, makes no mention whatsoever of a display technique for indicating whether or not particular radiation sources are within the field of view of particular radiation receivers. Indeed, while the examiner contends that the section discloses “a display device,” the only mention in the section of something which might be deemed a display device is reference to “generation of virtual reality computer graphics.”

Rochelle has nothing to do with measuring the relative location of points on a vehicle nor does it contain any disclosure or suggestion of a display technique for indicating whether or not particular radiation sources are within the field of view of particular radiation receivers. The reference really has nothing to do with display techniques.


While Hendrix discloses a measuring system which does include a display device 22 and utilizes plural fixed emitters and camera sensors, there is no suggestion in the reference of a display technique which indicates, for each source, whether or not is in the field of view of a particular sensor.

Thus, the fundamental aspect of applicants' invention is simply not found in either of the cited references. It follows, *a fortiori*, that it can neither be taught nor suggested by any combination of these references.

For these reasons it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1-28 be reconsidered and withdrawn and that the application be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

Seyfarth Shaw LLP
Attorneys for Assignee
55 East Monroe Street
Suite 4200
Chicago, Illinois 60603-5803
312-346-8000

By 
Harold V. Stotland, Reg. No. 24,492